hardly do any. One dinner a term, perhaps two. Some receptions. Lots of mail. Not surprisingly the results are not exactly spectacular. In 1994, my last campaign, and which will be my last campaign, the Federal Elections Commission records our having raised \$6,100,147. This is for the State of New York, the third most populous in the nation. But it sufficed. For practical purposes, all the money went to television, with the incomparable Doug Schoen keeping an eye on the numbers lest trouble appear unexpectedly. Our campaign staff never had ten persons. which may sound small to some, but I believe was our largest ever. Even so. we have done well. In 1988, I received some 4,000,000 votes and won by more than 2,000,000 votes, the largest numerical margin of victory in any legislative election in history. I say all this simply to note that just possibly money isn't everything. But if we think it is, it might as well be. And so we must persevere.

This July, in his celebrated Wall Street Journal column, Paul Gigot referred to me as an "old pol" and an "ever loval Democrat." I wrote to thank him, for this is pretty close to the truth. If I have spent time in universities it was usually seeking sanctuary after a failed election, my own or others. I go back before polling, and before television. (Although in 1953 I did write a 15-minute television speech for the Democratic candidate for Mayor of New York City, Robert F. Wagner, Jr. It might have been seen by 10,000 people.) But of course polling caught on, as the mathematics got better, and television has never stopped. And these, of course, are the technologies that seemingly confound us today. But this subject has been with us the longest while.

Congress first placed restrictions on political spending with the Naval Appropriations Bill of 1867 which prohibited Navy officers and Federal employees from soliciting campaign funds from navy yard workers.

Faced with allegations that corporations had bought influence with contributions to his campaign, President Theodore Roosevelt called for campaign finance reform in his 1905 and 1906 State of the Union addresses. In response, Congress passed the Tillman Act of 1907, banning corporate gifts to Federal candidates. And during World War II, the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, known as the Smith-Connally Act, temporarily prohibited unions from making contributions in Federal elections. In 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act made this wartime measure permanent. As my colleagues well know, these bans have been made virtually irrelevant with the advent of so-called "soft money."

Requirements for the disclosure of donors originated in the so-called Publicity Act of 1910 which required the treasurer of political committees to reveal the names of all contributors of \$100 or more. Congress expanded the

disclosure rules with the 1925 Federal Corrupt Practices Act, requiring political committees to report total contributions and expenditures. The Court upheld this Act in Burroughs v. United States, declaring that Congress has the prerogative to "pass appropriate legislation to safeguard (a Presidential) election from the improper use of money to influence the result." We continue to debate how to exercise that prerogative today.

But may I focus on one particular aspect of campaign funding, which is relatively new? Money for television. Ease this by providing free television time—those are public airways—and as much about the problem goes away as will ever be managed in this vale of toil and sin

Max Frankel, the long-time and venerable editor of the New York Times and a wise and seasoned observer of American politics, addressed this issue in the October 26, 1997 New York Times Magazine:

The movement to clean up campaign financing is going nowhere for the simple reason that the reformers are aiming at the wrong target. They are laboring to limit the flow of money into politics when they should be looking to limit the candidates' need for money to pay for television time. It is the staggering price of addressing the voters that drives the unseemly money chase.

To run effectively for major office nowadays one needs to spend millions for television commercials that spread your fame, shout your slogans, denounce your opponents, and counteract television attacks. A campaign costing \$10 million for a governorship or seat in the Senate is a bargain in many states. The President, even with all the advantages of the White House at his command, appears to have spent more than \$250 million on television ads promoting his reelection in 1996. \$250 million!

The problem of so-called "issue advocacy" is only fueling the amount of money going into television ads and further distorting our electoral system. On February 10, 1998, Tim Russert delivered the fifth annual Marver H. Bernstein Symposium on Governmental Reform at Georgetown University. In his address, he asserted that "television ads paid for by the candidates themselves are (not) going to be the problem in future election cycles. That distinction will be earned by so-called 'issue advocacy' advertising by ideological and single issue groups.' He made the point that, unlike candidates, these groups are not subject to campaign contribution limits or disclosure requirements.

In Buckley v. Valeo the Supreme court held that these ads are protected speech under the First Amendment. We are told that requiring such groups to disclose their list of contributors might be a violation of the First Amendment under NAACP v. Alabama. Mr. Russert contends that "unless the Fourth Estate is able to identify these groups and ferret out their funding, and explain their agenda, many elec-

tions could very well be taken hostage by a select band of anonymous donors and political hit men." There must be a better way.

Might I suggest that the way to reduce the influence of these "select band of anonymous donors and political hit men" and to reduce the ungodly amount of money being used in campaigns is free television time for candidates. Frankel writes:

It would be cheaper by far if Federal and State treasuries paid directly for the television time that candidates need to define themselves to the public—provided they purchased no commercial time of their own. Democracy would be further enhanced if television stations that sold time to special interest groups in election years were required, in return for the use of the public spectrum, to give equal time to opposing views. But so long as expensive television commercials are our society's main campaign weapons, politicians will not abandon the demeaning and often corrupt quest for ever more money from ever more suspect sources.

The version of the McCain-Feingold bill we have been considering restricts so-called "soft money"—contributions that national, state, county, and local party organizations may collect and spend freely provided only that the television messages they produce with the funds are disguised to appear "uncoordinated" with any candidate's campaign. This is a good first step. But it is not enough. Even if soft money and slimy variants were prohibited, political money would reappear in liquid or vaporous form. If we want to make significant changes with regard to how we conduct campaigns, we must—to repeat Frankel—look beyond limiting the flow of money into politics and rather look to limiting the candidates' need for money to pay for television time. Frankel concludes his piece on campaign finance reform by stating that "there is no point dreaming of a law that says 'you may not' so long as the political system daily teaches the participants 'you must.' Until candidates for office in America are relieved of the costly burden of buying television time, the scandals will grow." He could not be more right.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

VERMONT RURAL FIRE PROTECTION TASK FORCE Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I first thank Senator Bond for all of his hard work on the FY 2000 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill, and the attention he paid to priorities in my home State of Vermont. I would like to briefly discuss with the Senator from Missouri the \$600,000 provided in the Conference Report for the Vermont Rural Fire Protection Task Force.

It is my understanding that the funds provided are for the purchase of personal safety equipment that includes, but is not limited to the following: selfcontained breathing apparatus, fire resistant turn out gear (helmets, coats pants, boots, hoods, gloves, and the like), personal pagers, personal accountability system to fulfill requirements of OSHA's two in two out rule, portable radios and personal hand lights. The need for new firefighting equipment is great in Vermont, because of the new OSHA regulations. I hope that the funds provided in this bill will be matched 50 percent with non-federal funds.

Further, it is my understanding that the funds will be administered by the Vermont Rural Fire Protection Task Force supported by the George D. Aiken and the Northern Vermont Resource Conservation and Development Council.

Mr. BOND. The Senator from Vermont has accurately described the intentions of the Conference Report accompanying the FY 2000 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, October 19, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,670,293,241,725.48 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy billion, two hundred ninety-three million, two hundred forty-one thousand, seven hundred twenty-five dollars and forty-eight cents).

One year ago, October 19, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,541,765,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-one billion, seven hundred sixty-five million)

Five years ago, October 19, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,705,195,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred five billion, one hundred ninety-five million).

Ten years ago, October 19, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,876,712,000,000 (Two trillion, eight hundred seventy-six billion, seven hundred twelve million).

Fifteen years ago, October 19, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,592,001,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred ninety-two billion, one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,078,292,241,725.48 (Four trillion, seventy-eight billion, two hundred ninety-two million, two hundred forty-one thousand, seven hundred twenty-five dollars and forty-eight cents) during the past 15 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMER-GENCY WITH RESPECT TO NAR-COTICS TRAFFICKERS IN COLOM-BIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 67

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON. The White House, October 20, 1999.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

H.R. 1497. An act to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the women's business center program.

H.R. 1887. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish the depiction of animal cruelty.

H.R. 3046. An act to preserve limited Federal agency reporting requirements on banking and housing matters to facilitate congressional oversight and public accountability, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1405(b) of the Child Online Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 231), the Speaker appoints the following members on the part of the House to the Commission on Online Child Protection:

Mr. John Bastian of Illinois, engaged in the business of providing Internet filtering or blocking services or software. Mr. William L. Schrader of Virginia, en-

Mr. William L. Schrader of Virginia, engaged in the business of proving Internet access services.

Mr. Stephen Balkam of Washington, D.C., engaged in the business of providing labeling or rating services.

Mr. J. Robert Flores of Virginia, and academic export in the field of technology.

Mr. William Parker of Virginia, engaged in the business of making content available over the Internet.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1405(b) of the Child Online Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 231), and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, the Speaker appoints the following members on the part of the House of the Commission on Online Child Protection:

Mr. James Schmidt of California, engaged in the business of making content available over the Internet.

Mr. George Vrandenburg of Virginia, engaged in the business of providing domain name registration services.

Mr. Larry Shapiro of California, engaged in the business of providing Internet portal or search services.

At 2:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 8:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2841. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for greater fiscal autonomny consistent with other United States jursdiction, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1497. An act to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the women's business center program; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 3046. An act to preserve limited Federal agency reporting requirements on banking and housing matters to facilitate congressional oversight and public accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE

The following bill was read twice and place on the calendar:

H.R. 2140. An act to improve protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-367. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to trucks entering California from foreign nations; to the Committee on Finance.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas, A recent study by the United States Government Accounting Office (GAO) found that Mexican commercial trucks entering the United States often fail to meet basic safety standards; and

Whereas, The GAO reported that Mexican trucks entering the United States may have serious safety violations impacting highway safety, including broken suspension systems, substandard tires, inoperable brakes, overweight loads, and improperly maintained hazardous material loads; and

Whereas, The report of the federal Office of the Inspector General titled, "Motor Carrier